

REMARKS

Claims 1-49 stand rejected.

Claims 1-49 remain pending in the application.

Claim Rejections Based Upon 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-6, 9-10, 15-29, 31, and 36-49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,072,864 (Shtivelman et al.). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 1 recites an SCP configured to receive a third message and to process the third message to generate call handling information for a call, wherein the third message includes a first speed dial number. Claim 1 also recites a switching system linked to the SCP and configured to transmit the third message for the SCP. Shtivelman does not anticipate claim 1.

Applicant concurs that Shtivelman teaches a telecommunications system having an SCP and a third message that contains a speed dial number as asserted in the Action (Office Action, 11/20/2002, page 2). *However, Shtivelman does not disclose the speed dial number processed by the SCP.* Shtivelman only discloses the speed dial number processed by a network cloud 1000. Shtivelman does not disclose which element within the network cloud 1000 actually processes the speed dial number.

Shtivelman discloses a call center 1010 including a telephony switch 1011 connected to a network cloud 1000 by a high bandwidth telephony trunk (Shtivelman, col 6, lines 8-19). A trunk is a communication line between two switching systems such as central office equipment and PBXs (*Newton's Telecom Dictionary*, Harry Newton, 2002). The network cloud 1000 could be a publicly switched telephone network (PSTN) (Shtivelman, col 6, lines 20-25). Thus, Shtivelman discloses the call center 1010 connected to the network cloud 1000 via a trunk line

from the telephony switch 1011 to a central office switch typical within PSTNs such as the network cloud 1000.

Shtivelman also discloses an 800 number processed by an SCP in the network cloud 1000 (Shtivelman, col. 6, lines 20-29). Next, Shtivelman discloses a speed dial number processed by the network cloud 1000 (Shtivelman, col. 7, lines 27-31). *The fact that the SCP processes the initial 800 number does not imply that the SCP also processes the speed dial number.* In fact, because the telephony switch 1011 of the call center 1010 is connected to the central office switch of the PSTN by the trunk line, telephony switch 1011 must transmit the speed dial number to the central office switch. The central office switch would then process the speed dial number to determine instructions to route the call *without involving the SCP*. In contrast, claim 1 specifically recites a third message containing the speed dial number processed by the SCP. This is not disclosed by Shtivelman.

The system of Shtivelman is very similar to the prior art systems referenced in the Background. As detailed, prior art systems contain speed dial translation processing capabilities within communication devices having call redirection control logic such as telecommunications switches (Specification, page 3). Claim 1 recites limitations that provide distinct advantages over the prior art including limitations not disclosed by Shtivelman.

Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), the anticipating reference must teach every aspect of the claimed invention either explicitly or impliedly. With respect to Shtivelman, certain elements of claim 1 are disclosed, such as the switching system, the SCP, and the speed dial number. But the configuration of the elements as claimed is not disclosed. If the reference teachings must somehow be modified in order to meet the claims, a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 would be more appropriate (M.P.E.P. § 706.02).

Dependent claims 2-6, 9-10, 16-29, 31, 37-42, and 44-49 each recite further limitations that render these claims separately patentable over the prior art. However, because the limitations of base claims 1, 15, 22, 36, and 43 are sufficient to distinguish Shtivelman, the rejections based upon 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) are traversed.

Claim Rejections Based Upon 35 U.S.C. § 103

Dependent Claims 11-14 and 33-35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shtivelman et al., in view of U.S. Patent No. 5, 768,360 (Reynolds, et al.). While claims 11-14 and 33-35 each recite further limitations that render these separately patentable over the prior art, a discussion is not necessary because the limitations of base claims 1 and 22 are sufficient to distinguish Shtivelman in view of Reynolds.

CONCLUSION

The claims in their present form are allowable over the art of record. Applicant therefore solicits their allowance.

This Response is being filed within the Examiner's statutory period. Therefore, the Applicant believes no fees are due. However any additional fees may be charged to Deposit Account No. 21-0765.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 1/15/03

Tel. No.: 303-546-1300
Fax No.: 303-499-5426



Stephen S. Roche, Reg. No. 52,176

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

Customer No.: 028004